stored, or had an opportunity of returning to Her Majesty's dominions, be detained or tried in that foreign State for any offense committed prior to his surrender, other than the extradition crime proved by the facts on which the surrender is grounded." Such, then, was the commencement of the extradition difficulty. It originated exclusively in the treatment of the case of Lawrence by the United States, and not in the case of Winslow, the action in which case was simply consequential.

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERNATIONAL DISAGREEMENT. To the answer of Lord Derby (as above given) to

To the answer of Lord Derby (as above given) to the American demand for the extradition of Winslow, Mr. Fish replied that there was nothing in the original treaty which precluded the United States from trying a criminal once surrendered " for any offense other than the particular offense for any offense other than the particular offense for which he was extradited;" but that on the contrary, the right to do so under the treaty was fully sus-tained "by judicial decisions, by the practice of both Governments, and by the understanding of persons most familiar with proceedings in such cases;" and finally, that Great Britain, by the act of 1870, had changed the spirit and terms of the cases;" and finally, that Great Britain, by the act of 1870, had changed the spirit and terms of the original treaty of 1842, and, without the assent of the United States had attached to it new conditions. The right to thus modify the treaty, he added, the President cannot recognize; and in his further licter of May 22, 1876 (Ex. Doc. 173, p. 35) Mr. Fish does not hesitate (though in a somewhat indirect way) to characterize the conduct of Great Britain as most discourteous, and even as involving a gratuitous

of May 22, 1876 (Ex. Doe. 173, p. 35) Mr. Fish dees not besitate (though in a somewhat indirect way) to characterize the cn fluct of Great Britain as most discourteons, and even as involving a gratuitous insult to his journ Government.

The points of disagreement between the two Governments being thus clear, it is next in order to inquire how the respective positions will stand too test of analysis. And in instituting such an analysis it may be first remarked that in judging of the right of contracting parties under any treaty or contract, it must be admitted that the letter governs primarily; but if the letter prove ambiguous or uncertain, then the spirit, so far as it can be ascertained from precodents or attending circumstances. Now the letter of the treaty in question is that for certain specifically enumerated offenses extradition shall be granted, which phraseology, necording to every rational principle of interpretation, certainly implies that for non-enumerated offenses there shall be no extradition, otherwise the phraseology of the treaty would have been "all" and not in effect "some."

Again, the treaty prescribes the methods by which its provisions are to be made operative. There is to be demand and the submission of evidence. Phis in turn implies, what has been acknowledged, that the country asked to surrender a fugitive shall have the right before surrender to pass upon the character of the offense with which he is charged, the causes which led to it, and the social or political conditions under which it was committed. Thus, in the casse of Anderson, Great Britain (Canada) refused to surrender to secure his freedom, demanded on the charge of marder, on the ground that by the common law or the law of England the act was not murder; and the United States has in turn refused to surrender an Irish tenant charged with killing an evicting Irish landlord. In short, all the above commerated conditions of surrender are such essential elements of the treaty that no extradition in the first brish landlord. In short, all the goove camerated conditions of surrender are such essential elements of the treaty that no extradition in the first instance would be possible without their strict and formal observance; and if this be of the treaty that no extrachition in the first instance would be possible without their strict and formal observance; and if this be so, can there possibly be any such construction of the treaty as a whole, which would warrant an cr parle assumption of the waiver or annathment of these conditions? Nay, more, is it not in the mature of a self-evideat proposition, that for the United States to demand of Great Britain a fuzzitive for a special official of the special officials, and, after having received him, try him for some other offense not specified in the demand—one for which he was not surrendered; one in respect to which the country extrachting had not an opportunity to pass upon—is a plain and immissivability to pass upon our shores, but in the sense of the treaty, in a legal sense, and it would seem in all common sense, he is within our jurisdiction for the purpose only for which he was specially demanded and extradited. This is the view of the French, who have unquestionably given more attention to this subject than any other nation; for as far back as 1841 the French Department of Justice issued a circular forbadding the trial in France of any extradited offender for any offense offer than the one for which he was surrendered, and directing that whenever in any case evidence of a new offense should come to light in the course of the proceedings, a new demand, with the usual formalities, should be made on the country from which the criminal had been originally extradited for a remewed surrender on the new charge. That this view must of necessity be also the correct view would seem to follow when it is considered that the adoption of any other view would be, in effect, the denal of the right of Great Britain or of the united States to constitute their territory an asylum to refinese, may

had tried him for circulating the Protestant Boble (until recently a criminal offense in Spain), would not the country with one voice have demanded of Great Britain or of Spain not only that the trials in question be stopped, but that apology—instant and ample—be offered, with war as the alternative of hesitation or refusal? Would not an administration or a political party that even proposed to negotiate on the subject be swept out of place and power as with a whirlwind? In short, there is here involved and at stake a principle of free and—free dom for political thought and action, freedom for the stave, freedom for religious belief, and finally freedom from vexitious commercial restrictions, which, of all nations, it is least becoming to the United States to any way weaken or invalidate. Lord Borby in one of its dispatches raises this very point, i. c. that the essition taken by Mr. Fish impairs the privilege of political asylum, and pats the direct question of how he proposes to meet it. And how does Mr. Fish meet in? He says there is no danger so far as the United States to coverned, to be apprehended under this head, because of (we quote his exact languages) "the inherent, inborn love of freedom, both of thought and action, engraved on the hearts of the people of this country so deeply that no law can reach, and no administration would dare to violate." All of which on its face seems very fine, but becomes simply stuff and nonscopes in view of the fact that what Mr. Fish says engraved on the hearts of the geogle of the con-so deeply that no law can reach, and no administra-tion would dare to violate." All of which on its face seems very fine, but becomes simply stuff and non-sense in view of the fact that wind Mr. Fish says the sentiment of the American people would never allow to be done, actually was done, when under his own ampices Lawrence was armigned in Now-York for an offense for which he was never extradited; for an offense which is not included under the treaty; which is not an offense recognized by international law, and which holds the same relation to popular sentiment in Great Britain that the act of "Fenian-ism" or the circulation of Protestant Bibles in Catholic countries, sustains to the popular sentiment of the people of the United States.

THE COMMON SENSE VIEW OF THE CASE, Viewed under these circumstances, how then does the case stand? Great Britain has virtually said, in all courtesy, to the United States: "We have surrendered Lawrence, but there has been some misunderstanding in the matter, and if we had understood things as we do now we should not have allowed you to have taken him from our territory for the purpose of imprisonment and trial for sanagling. Recognize this misunderstanding, and grant to Law-Recognize this misunderstanding, and grant to Lawrence the privileges and excaptions which we have mwittingly helped to deprive him of; and, above all, in the name of civilization and of humanity, be careful how you, a republic, ask us to establish a precedent that may be used to the impairment of political liberty by the nations of Europe with whom we come more immediately in contact, and which have not such 'an inherent, inborn love of fresdom' as would restrain them from arbitrary and unscrupplous proceedings for the purpose of obtaining possession for the purpose of punishment of such political refugees and offenders as Carl Schurz, Franz Sigel, Louis Kossuth, Ginseppe Mazzini, and John Mitchel."

What to such a presentation of the case should we naturally have expected to have been the answer of

What to such a presentation of the case should we naturally have expected to have been the answer of the United States? Why, to this effect: "We see clearly that there has been a misunderstanding about the meaning of this treaty; and as we would not like to have you take advantage of a misunderstanding on our part, so we will not take an advantage of a misunderstanding on your part. Our inborn love of freedom is so great that we would not do, or seem to do, anything that would tend to impair civil, political, or religious liberty; and pending discussion and agreement as to what the treaty does mean, we will not exercise doubtful powers for the sake of punishing one secondrel, especially if by so doing the treaty is to be made inoperative, and each country be thereby constituted the respective Alsatias for all the secondrels of the other." Such would have been the language of one gentleman to another, had the misunderstanding been individual rather than public. But how did Mr. Fish answer? He said, virtually: "We acknowledge there has been a misunderstanding on your part; but there is none on our part. We have got Lawrence in our possession, and having got him it is none of your concern what we do with him. If you refuse to give up other secondrels, on demand, we shall do the same, and will make no other treaty unless you adopt our sentiments." Which of the two countries, we appeal to the American people, has acted the part of a gentleman, and which the part of the bully?

THE QUESTION OF PRECEDENTS. But admitting that the wording of the Treaty of 1842 is so indefinate as to render its interpretation doubtful, the inquiry which next arises is, Has there been anything in the experience of the United States since the ratification of the treaty which will aid in determining its proper construction? And in answer to this it may be said, first, that in 1818 Com-

gress passed an act (which was reënacted in the Revised Statutes of 1875) for the purpose of giving effect to all treaties of extradition then existing between the United States and foreign countries, or which "hereafter may exist;" which says that when a fugative demanded under the treaty is given up by the United States, he shall be surrendered by the order of the Secretary of State to the foreign Government "to be tried for the crime of which such shall be so accused." Again, in Section 5,275 of the Revised Statutes, it is provided that the President shall employ all needful power at his command for the protection of a person extradited to the United States "until the final conclusion of his trial for the crimes or offenses specified in his command for the protection of a person extradited to the United States "until the final conclusion of his trial for the crimes or offenses specified in the warrant of extradition." Now, certainly the language of these statutes does not imply that a person once surrendered may be subsequently tried for an offense of which he was not accused previous to his extradition; but on the other hand, if there is any precise meaning in words, they certainly do imply a limitation of the purpose of the surrender, to a frial for the specific offense for which accusation and demand was made and extradition acceded to, and an exclusion of every other purpose. Certainly if the persons (members of the Judiciary Committee off Congress) who drew up and passed this act of 1848 had an idea that a fugitive delivered up under it for a specific offense, or to justice generally, it is contrary to common sense to suppose that the language in which they clothed their ideas would not have been altogether different.

Again, since 1842, the United States has made Again, since 1842, the United States has made four extraction treaties with other nations—Italy, salvador, Nicaragua, and Belgium—in all of which the principle centended for by Great Britain, namely, that extradited persons can be tried only on extradition charges, has been admitted and incorporated in clear and definite language; the provision in the treaty with Ecuador (1872) for example, reading as follows:

follows:

"The person or persons delivered up, charged with the erlnes specified in the foregoing article, sind not be proscented for any crime committed previously to that for which his or their extradition may be asked."

Now, is it to be supposed that the United States, in

for which his or their extradition may be asked."

Now, is it to be supposed that the United States, in dealing with so general a subject as the administration of justice and the repression of crime, would give to these countries guarantees against a possible infrangement of their sovereignty or their "right of asylum," and deny the same favors to Great Britain? Can it be doubted that if at the time of the ratification of the Treaty of 1842 Great Britain had asked for an additional clause, to the effect that hereafter she should be put on terms of equality with the most favored nations in respect to extradition privileges, that such a clause without hesitation would have been added? The legitimate inference from these facts therefore would seem to be that the entire action of the Government of the United States since 1842, in respect to extradition, has been to sustain the construction put upon the Treaty of 1842 by Great Britain, and to prove that the act of Parliament of Great Britain, which Mr. Fish regards as a flagrant violation of the treaty, was in fact nothing more than a simple decirration and definition of privileges and immunities prefxisting under the treaty, and not in any sense the introduction of new conditions into the bargain which did not exist at the time the borrain was made. tions into the bargain which did not exist the time the bargain was made. TWO VIEWS OF THE SAME MATTER.

There is also a further point brought out by Lord Derby in his dispatch of June 30 to Col. Hoffman, which almost conclusively demonstrates that the original interpretation put upon the treaty by the Washington Cabinet was in harmony with that adopted by the British Government, and that some powerful influence afterward came in to occasion a change in opinion. Thus, between 1871 and 1873, the making of a new and extended treaty of extradition was under consideration by the two Governments, and, as preliminary to so doing, a draft was prepared. In this draft was incorporated the fol-

ments, and the property of the large was incorporated. In this draft was incorporated by either of the high contracting parties to the other, such person shall not, until ue has been restored or had an opportunity of returning to the constraint whence he was surrendered, be triable or tried for any effense committed in the other country prior to the sare reader, other than the particular offense on account of reader, other than the particular offense on account.

or had an opportunity of returning to the constity whence he was surrendered, be triable or tried for any offense commuted in the other country prior to the surrender, other than the particular offense on account of which he was surrendered.

Now, according to Lord Derby, while the two Governments were unable to come to a full agreement as to various new points brought up for incorporation in the new treaty, there was not only no objection whatever made at any time by Mr. Fish to the above sixth article, but on the contrary Mr. Fish gave the article a more or less direct approval by preposing to amend it by adding the following words:

No person shall be deemed to have had an opportunity of returning to the country whence he was surrendered and two months at least shall have elapsed after he shall have been set at identy and free to return.

It may not be an inconvenient question for the Secretary of State to answer, but it is a very pertinent question for the American public to ask, wind it was that induced him to take one view of this very important state matter in 1873, and a diametrically opposite view in 1875 ! Fertings Mr. Edwards before your intended the formation of the family of the right of this Government to try an extradited offender for an offense for which he was not surrendered is so clear and massailable, he instructed the New-York District-Attorney on the 226 of December, 1875, that to do so "involved consequences of a New-York District-Attorney on the 22d of December, 1875, that to do so "involved consequences of a very serious nature," and that he must "proceed in strict conformity with international law and inter-

law. But conceiling the maximum of weight and anthenticity that can be clinifed for such precedents, such weight and authenticity are very limited. There has been no one instance prior to the Lawrence case, in which either country has tried an extradited furtilive for an offense which was not among the offense's enumerated under the treaty, or for an offense which was not by stainte and public opinion in both countries unanimously conceded to be one for which the fugitive ought to be held responsible. Furthermore, there has been no previous instance in which either country has nersisted in trying an extradited fugitive for an effense other than that for which he was surrendered, in known opposition to the wishes and in the race of the protest of the country that surrendered him. If, therefore, there has been a technical discussant of the letter of the treaty, the spirit of it has in no sense been violated by any of the procedents to which Mr. Fish mas made refrence; and to parade them at all as constituting justification for trying an extradited fugitive for an offense for which he was not only not surrendered under the treaty, and which, moreover, is not an offense in the sense of nation as extra direction of surrendered under the treaty, and which in a country justific court would be regarded as savering of small trickery and petitiograps. The same remark will also apply with greater force and pertinency to the citation by Mr. Fish in his dispatches of the language of British jurists, in which the word "offense" is made applicable by him to acts, which in the British law were not offenses, and which with the Writers and speakers referred to had an entirely different significant. Thus, when Mr. Hammond, formerly British than the sense and in the British law were not offenses, and which with the Writers and speakers referred to had an entirely different signification. Thus, when Mr. Hammond, formerly British Chader Secretary of State, is quoted by Mr. Fish as saying, "We admit if a man is bona fale tried for an

AN INTERPRETATION NOT YET CONSIDERED. But the point which unquestionably has had the greatest influence in determining public opinion in the United States, in respect to this extradition difficulty, and the one which Mr. Fish has made the most of in the support of his position, is the assumption and assertion that Great Britain by her act of 1870 radically changed the stipulations of the treaty of 1842, without the consent of the United States, and thereby, to say the least, acted most discourteonsly. That this assumption and assertion have no sufficient warrant, in a fair interpretation of the actual facts, it has aiready been attempted to show; but admitting the contrary, there is a most notable matter of precedent which Mr. Fish and all others who have thus far discussed the question have very cariously overlooked, and which, it would seem, on the ground of consistency alone, ought to effectually depart he United States from pleading the Parliamentary act of 1870 either as a matter of reproach to Great Britain or as a justification of our own position. The precedent referred to is as follows: But the point which unquestionably has had the Parliamentary act of 1870 either as a matter of reproach to Great Britain or as a justification of our own position. The precedent referred to is as follows:

It is well known that the United States has dealt with the Indian tribes within its territory through the medium of treaties executed in the same manner and with the same formalities as is the case of treaties with foreign nations. Now, in the year 1866, after the Internal Revenue laws of the United States had been fully established and understood, the United States made a treaty with the Cherokee nation of Indians, in which among other things it was agreed that "every Cherokee Indian and freed person residing in the Cherokee nation shall have the right to sell any products of his farm, including live stock or any merchandise or mannfactured products, and to drive and ship the same to market without restraint, paying any tax thereon which is now or may be levied by the United States on the quantity sold outside the Indian territory." Some years after this the Internal Revenue offices of the United States, in virtue of an act of Congres passed in 1858, by which the operations of the internal revenue laws of the United States were extended to spirits, tobacco, and other specific articles, "produced anywhere within the exterior boundaries of the United States, whether the same be within a collection district or not," entered the Cherokee territory, and in default of the payment of

taxes, seized manufactured tobacco, raw material and other property, which it was admitted were never within any collection district, and never had been sold or offered for sale outside of the Indian country. A suit in restraint of such proceedings having been instituted by the Cherokees owning or representing the property seized, and the case coming by writ of error from the United States District Court of Western Arkansas to the United States Supreme Court, the latter court, while admitting all the facts in respect to the provisions of the treaty as above stated, nevertheless gave judgment that the act of Congress superseding the treaty was legitamate and constitutional, and that the Indians, whatever may have been their position morally, had no case legally, the language of the Court being as follows: "A treaty may supersed a prior act of Congress, and an act of Congress may supersed a prior treaty. In the case under consideration the act of Congress must prevail as if the treaty were not an element to be considered." Two Judges, Davis and Bradley, dissented, and the latter in expressing the dissent, thus clearly stated the facts and sequences of the case: "The exempt jurisdiction here depends on a solemn treaty entered into between the United States Government and the Cherokee nation, in which the good faith of the Government is involved. It is conceded that the law in question cannot be extended to the Indian territory without an implied abregation of the treaty pro lasto. And the opinion of the Court goes upon the principle that Congress has the power to supersede the provisions of a treaty."

Here then we have the old fable again illustrated. Ph 1808 it was the United States ball that gored the Cherokee ox; and the poor Cherokee in applying for refress, got none, and if he had ventured to complain, and (adopting the exact language of Mr. Fish) sternly and honestly denounced the proceedings of the United States ox, and now words will hardly suffice the States because of the impact of the Cherokee ox; and

"was not an element to be considered," and see what they have to answer.

There is an old and well-known maxim "that he who demands equity should be prepared to discquity," and, tried by the maxim, the recent record of the United States is not of a kind that can well be referred to with pride or as illustrative of high national morality. The treatment of the Cherokee Indianas under the treaty of 1868 has already been cited; the inclination of Congress to devote the Alabama award to unlawful uses; the reluctance to give back to the kindly Japanese an indemnity which it is acknowledged ought never to have been exacted from them; the agreement under the treaty

Finally, any review of the Extradition difficulty would be incomplete which failed to call attention to the present singular position that Lawrence, the primary cause of all the trouble, at present sustains to the Government; and this is best done by copying the following articles, which have recently appeared in the New-York press;

Jayne declares openly that he had Lawrence's confosion traplicating several Cestem-base officials of tremmence, all of whom he infended to expand, and he went before Secretary Briston with charges. The release of Lawrence followed close upon this avowal, and suspicion was aroused that a compromise that beneficited, by which Lawrence was to protest such of his necomplies as but in a compromise that be en-effected, by which Lawrence was to protest such of his necomplies as but in the testry nor only against Des Anges and one other Chistom-noise officially three or four necessaries that he will testry nor only any small deniers, against whom in proceedings to receive a training the condition of the control of the

wrenes. From all this it is manifest that the current is to From all this it is many in this currous and disreputing on some further act in this currous and disreputing the drama as soon as Ben. Butter, Jayne, Bliss & Co. can arrange the necessary machinery.

DAVID A. WELLS. Norwick, Aug. 3, 1876.

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ABSTRACT OF THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DEAN. The Rev. Dr. George F. Seymour, Dean of the General Theological Seminary, has submitted his re-port to the Board of Trustees. The following statement of the condition of the institution is taken from this re-

The professors and students have enjoyed a year of unterrupted peace and quiet. The health of the students has been during the current year, as it has been for many years past, excellent. Since the last annual meeting of the Board of Trustees the seminary has been the recipient of valuable dountions. Prof. R. C. Hall. M. A., who several years ago fitted up and turnished at his own expense a fecture room for his classes, has added to his beneficidins an elegant clock, which has been placed in the main half of the cast building. A statent of the Senior Class has recently presented five acotes for the chapel savviers. The Horary of the institution is again indeficed to the Society for Promoting Religion and Learning for an addition of many volumes to its shelves. In addition to this benefaction the society leads its helping hand to many of the students. The sums thus bestowed exceed, in the aggregate, \$12,000. During the past year the seminary has and the offer of several large donations of money for the endowment of scholarships and prizes. There is a difficulty, and only one, in the way of accepting them. The statute of the institution, as it now stands, limits the amount of interest to be paid on such gifts to five per cost a year. The attention of the trusteen is called to this important matter, and they are asked to take such action as seems to them wise and indicions. The donations thus tendered are no follows: An endowment of a scholarship, assued after the late Eishen Donne of New-Jersey, amounting to about \$4,000; a scholarship of \$2,000, to be paid over to the seminary on the death of the interest of the interest of the interest of the nature of the results of the proposed to change what has always been the arrangement, so that the year wall begin about the middle of September and the agen donor, who, the order are agent of the proposed to change what has always been the arrangement, so that the year will begin about the middle of september and end before Trinity Sunday. The prospect of a large accession of students at the opening of the next academic year is very promising; over 20 have already applied for

THE PRETENDED SPIRIT MEDIUM. Rufus Wagner Flint, the "writing medium" who used a tin tea-pot for unsealing the letters of his dupes to "the spirits," was before Judge Westbrook again yesterday, on an order to show cause why be should not be discharged from the sherill's enstedy. The prisoner is accused of contempt of the order of the court to pay his wife (who has sued him for divorce) allmony and comsel fee. For a long time he could not be cantured, but was at length entrapped by a decoy letter and tured, but was at length entrapped by a decoy letter and taken to prison under an attachment, and from this lenked to be relieved, pleading insubility to make payment. Jonn D. Townsend, the wife's counsel, applied for a further adjournment until Tauraday, that he might prepare an answer to the adidavits recently made by the defendant. "I see no great hardship in this," said Mr. Townsend. "His own adidavits sink that since he was last in court he has received fourteen or fitteen letters. This being the case, all he wants is a new tea-pot, and he can carry on als business just as well in jail."

The court granted the adjournment, and Flint went metality back to the sail. PEOPLE'S CANVASS.

MR. GODWIN AND REFORM EFFORTS. DANGER OF HIS LETTER DIVERTING REFORMERS FROM PRACTICAL WORK-LABOR TO SECURE COMPETENT CONGRESSMEN THEIR BEST POLICY. o the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: The Fifth Avenue Conference having done me the honor to appoint me one of the Vice-Presidents for Pennsylvania, I may perhaps reasonably ask of THE TRIBUNE space for a brief notice of the letter which Mr. Parke Godwin has seen fit to address to the members and adherents of that body.

With every feeling of respect for Mr. Godwin's well-

known carnestness in the cause of reform, I cannot belp thinking that the evident partiality, not to say partisanship, which it displays will defeat its object and neutralize its capacity for cvil. The comparison of the merits of the two candidates, for instance, might carry weight with voters ignorant of their respective records, were it not for the special pleading, too artiessly transparent to be disingenuous, of the argument to justify his preference for the financial policy of the Democrats. Where so zealous an advocate for a sound currency as Mr. Godwin can persuade himself by such a train of reasoning to sustain the hybrid ticket of Tilden and Hendricks because of a vaporous piece of declamation in a platform drawn up, as is said, by Manton Marble, and this, too, in spite of the unvarying record of the party since the war, we can only wonder at the strength of the predispositions which can thus blind his judgment, and we must decline to accept his concinsions on any other point on which he is liable to be warped by the same influences.

All this appears to me so self-evident that I would not trespass on your space were it not that I think Mr. Godwin's letter likely to injure, in another direction, the cause which we all have at heart, by dividing our forces and diverting our attention from the most important Issue before us, wherever by united action we may be

able to accomplish substantial cood.

The Fifth Avenue Conference may not have resulted in all that its promoters hoped for, and yet it unquestiona-bly had no little influence in obtaining for us the cheice between two candidates of a higher character than in advance seemed probable. Neither of them is an ideal statesman, in spite of Mr. Godwin's idealized portrait of his friend, and to pretend that either of them fills the measure of the requisites so eloquently set forth in Mr. Schurz's address would seem to me an insult to common sense. Between them, Mr. Godwin prefers to take his chances with Messrs. Tilden and Hendricks. I prefer to take mine with Messrs. Hayes and Wheeler unless, in-deed, the long incubation of Mr. Tilden's letter of acceptance should hatch forth some marvelous and unprecedent dented phoenix of statesmanship. Let not, however, Mr. Godwin and those of his way of thinking separate themselves from the rest of us. Let us hope that whoever may be elseted the Presidential chair shall have a worthy occupant, and let us address our united energy to what is really the most practicable and important measure of

Alabama award to uniawful uses; the reluctance to give back to the kindly Japanese an indeanity which it is acknowledged ought never to have been exacted from them; the agreement under the treaty of 1871 between the United States and Great Britain to admit free of duty and for a consideration into the United States the produce of the islaving of the Dommion of Canada, and then the subsequent and deliberate imposition by Congress of a Congress of the Dommion of Canada, and then the subsequent and deliberate imposition by Congress of a duty and he eases in which such produce is packed, there by and in opposition to the protest of Canada unititying the provisions of the treaty—all these are transactions which no American can recall with satisfaction, and do not well compert with the assumption on the part of the nation of light moral sensitiveness.

LAWRENCE'S SINGULAR POSITION.

Finally, any review of the Extradition difficulty would be incomplete which failed to call attention would be incomplete which failed to call attention to the present suggiar position that Lawrence, the primary cause of all the call attention who of the present suggiar position that Lawrence, the

JUST CRITICISM OF THE PRESIDENT. To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sig: I clip the inclosed letter, signed "Old office. Mr. Biss harded has shares in this scheme at all me between the metal and me between the meaning is at present manown. Lowerner, the intervence, is, however, to profit by the scheme, if successfull.

From N. Y. Tibous, July 2.

Prevailed for a Rain-Chartes L. Lawrenes and Wheeler and the Republican party. It does a fail not include a cause of many forms a failed grant. Politically it does harm to the cause of many forms a failed grant to the indictional accuses managing, who so goed anyhow. \* \* You burt your paper very not had take." For my part i sincerely hope "Old suiting contence, and it is generally believed that he sill not ugain to brought hour over. United States of the fail not ugain to brought hour over. United States of the fail not ugain to brought hour over. United States of the notifical again to brought into court. United States of the fail not ugain to brought and court. United States of the fail not ugain to brought part and its profits were said to be not prevent and the profits were said to be not prevent and the profits were said to be not prevent and the profits were said to be not prevent and the profits were said to be not prevent and the profits were said to be not prevent and the profits were said to be not prevent and the prevent and the prevent and the profits and prevent and the profits and the prevent to see that the monthed of the state of New York. If elected payable ends in the monthed to see that the will purity the National covernment with the most management in a him of the cause of the state of New York. If elected payable ends in the monthed to see the will purity the National covernment with the most management in the monthed to see the doing itself. To me it seems, if ever there was a course, incorable to journalism and minimize in itself. The Trimuse under its present management has hit of the lock in viru through your collusins for evidences of registing. I find there, aimset without locking, innuminable instances of importability, of independence, and of librar thought. May not be encouraged to continue a non-partisem, in their including a non-partisem, in the particular including a non-particular including and including a non-particular including

in your estimate of Grant, does not infinite that your near housesty node to the opinions you express, does no seemingly care how man of trues or crtor may be in southed, but have a his complaint on the ground of policy II is as if he said, "Whether right or wrong, doe'd as well will intit he party; whether right or wrong, doe'd os well will individe anniest your own interests." Doe he not time disclose the prevailing low moral standard—the same low moral standard that forms the hais o all your criticisms on Grant. To be sure, he fliadly set inneed up as a pugles of "Issie," but then the only credentials he presents will harrily be approved. In a par of his letter, not quoted, he asks you to condone Grant offenses on secount of past services. De so by all means but not until he has amended his bad practices; not until he has ceased to higher the country by the exhibition of moral of unseness and meutal heapar by in high offense, stee he is a node of medicarty and pervestity, an til he retire to private life. Constant Readen.

Chiesgo, Id., July 25, 1876.

HAYES NOT A TYPICAL REFORMER.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sm: I am one of the many who bailed with delight the meeting of prominent men at the Fifth wenne Hotel to take into consideration the deplorable political situation of the country. As the result of that conference, the address issued to the country was to me the harbinger of a purer state of political feeting. The the harbinger of a purer state of political feeling. The Republican porty in its nominations has paid no attention whatever to its advice. Mr. Hayes is undoubtedly an honest man. In every other respect Gov. Haves is not the man for President that the address called for, but is just file one it pointed out who should not have been nominated. In one of its most pangent sentences it says: "We shall support no candidate who, however favorably judged by his nearest friends, is not publicly known to possess those qualities of mind and character which the stern task of genuine reform requires; for the American people cannot now afford to risk the future of the Republic in e. perfuncts on merely supposed virtue or rumored ability to be trusted on the arrength of private recommendations. Does the non-ination of Gov. Hayes come up to the spirit of that manifestof Do we find blue in the foremost ranas of the reformers! Has he been in any respect of that manifestor 1 by we had a reason of that many respect the reformers that he been in any respect identified with reform in his own party! Has he been prominent in condemning the recedities of the Gran-Administration 1 I, for one, prefer to trust the great program of the property of the program of th Administration II, in the present of the Democratic party—the Tauranus, Bay and, Seymours, Dorsheimers, Gastons, Parkers, Lamars and Hewitts—rather than the equalty great leaders of the Republican party—the Chandlers, Camerons, Cornells, Conklings, Logans, and Packards.

\*\*Chifton, S. L., July 31, 1876.\*\*

MR. GODWIN A PREJUDICED ADVISER. To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Mr. Godwin is simply crazy in his logic when he argues, first, that the reform efforts and promises of the better party cannot be trusted, but, second, that the half-reform efforts and promises of the worse party can be trusted. Is he so sanguine as to early think that a party of low character changes materially when, in order to win, it chooses a head of high characters. It is the head that goes down rather than the party which comes up, even in the matter of faith, and as for practice Mr. Godwin could not miss the mark worse than to imagine that a Democratic Administration worse than to imagine that a Democratic Administration can be any better than the Democratic party. The mea wine, breause they thought this, helped put the Democratis into power in Congress have got a leason winch ought to suffice. It is "Tiden, right or wrong," which Mr. Godwin inscribes on his bancor. After saying that he does not see how there can be two answers to the question whether we shall "neglect this glorious opportunity, which pu's an overwhelming vote at our disposal, for the resens of the Government," he supplements this wild flight of perverse imagination by frankly saying, "But, be that as it may, I, who have for many years stood by this noble man and been the eye-witness of his fights with 'the beasta at Ephesias,' would be recreant to the labor and aspirations of my whole life not to lend him my heartiest support"—him and the Democratic party, that is. It may be necessary for Mr.

Godwin to be so fend and foolish about Mr. Tilden as to go for him, indifferent to everything, but the confession is not likely to leave him much weight as an adviser. Evidently Mr. Godwin speaks from a metive, not from reasons. East Marshfield, Mass., July 25, 1876.

MR. EVARTS'S MERITS. To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sin: Among the names suggested for the Republican nomination for Governor of the State of New-York is that of William M. Evarts. At the Convention which nominated Abraham Lincoln for President Mr. Evarts was present. When Mr. Lincoln received a sufficient number of votes to obtain the nomination, Mr. Evaris arose and said that he had voted for Mr. Seward, but now he moved that Mr. Lincoln's nomination be made unanimous. The motion gave great satisfaction apparently to every one at the Convention, and the nomination was at once made unantmous. When Annomination was at once made unanimous. When Andrew Johnson was impeached Mr. Evarts was requested to defend him. The peroration of Mr Evarts's closing argument at that trial is perhaps one of the most impressive and eloquent ever delivered in America. As a law yer his reputation is world-wide. It was fitting that he should be asked to deliver the cration at the Centennial celebration in Philadelphia. His oration has been read by militions of his countrymen. Those who rend such an oration feel that to some extent they are made acquainted with the orator, and many throughout the world now feel a personal friendship for Mr. Evarts. It is doubtful whether among all its able men there are any that would be more easily elected Governor of New-York, or more ably forther the reforms which the party desires to effect. Very respectfully. J. C. B., JR. Mount Washington, Mass., Aug. 1, 1876.

CAUSE OF THE HAMBURG MASSACRE. To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sin: The truth is, that while great changes for the better have been brought about in the South, yet we are very far from being emancipated from some of the worst evils bequeathed us by slavery. In slavery times Aboittionists were charged with increasing the rigors of slavery. But they were only the occasion by which the true nature of slavery was exhibited. The virus was there, and would remain until it was voluntarily put away. The majority of the whites in the South still put away. The majority of the whites in the South still deliberately and persistently draw the "cotor line" in the face of the civilization and Christianity of the age. The sentiments thus fostered are bound to result in Hambure massiacres whenever the occasion arises. There is no limit to the injustice and inhumanity to which such sentiments logically lead. Incidental causes may arouse it to action, but they do not clumpe its essential nature. Reconstruction and the advent of Northern men might possibly be occasions for arousing the old feeling; but so long as it is voluntarily cherished, and the color line is drawn by it in willful contempt of clearly perceived principles of justice, then we have an adequate cause for almost any citine. This race feeling, overhearing as it does the convictions of every enlightened mind and the plainest precepts of the Gospel, can assort fastif in no shall remain hable to Hamburg massacres.

\*\*Margville, Tenn., Aug. 1, 1876.\*\*

HARD-MONEY MEN SOUTH. To the Editor of The Tribune.

Six: In your editorial headed "The Irreconchables" occurs these scateness: "The country knows that the Democratic party is divided into two factions on this (the currency) question. The stronger faction, both numerically and in tenacity of purpose, demands meanditional and unqualified repudiation of a solemn pledge of the public faith." The former assertion is un pledge of the public faith." The former assertion is unquestremably true, but the latter does not seem so axiomatic. Now, in the candor which the course of The Trancse prompts, let me zek you if the East and the Pacific States, together with one or two Western States which are for hard money, and the hard-money faction in the South, do not form the stronger faction, at least numerically if That there is a hard-money faction in the South no one can doubt. But it is grossly misrenessented great many of its here who are peaked by some de-by Mr. Bright's financial heresies or by some de-cel newspapers. Will The Tame 8 do justice to I carnestly believe is a large minerity both in Tes 1. many of us here who are pained at being judge

MR. HAYES AND GRANTISM. To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: I am a Republican and have been from the formation of the party, and am therefore interested in its candidates. Mr. Hayes is no doubt an excellent citizen, but it would be of great interest to know just how for he has been identified with that portion of the how far he has been herefund with that persons. Republican party that have been for years laboring for its purification. Did he in 1872 see the tendencies that were disgracing the party! Was he found with the Grant party then I and if so, when did he discover anything wrong in it! If he has been able to get along comfortably with the ruscalliles of Grantism, how are we to know that he will be the man to stem the tide of it, which will be stronged hum in the persons of Cameron, Conking. that he will be the man to stem the tide of it, which will surround him in the persons of Cameron, Conkling, and Butler! Boes any one candidly believe these men are to sink out of the councils of the party! On the other band, what are the order band, what are the order band, what are the order band to lear from the election of Mr. Tiden! To say that he will necessarily be controlled by the Democratic party is but to repeat the argument used against Mr. Greeley, which Liberals like my self disregarded. But so far Mr. Tiden has not shown much disposition to accept the control of any one.

Antherp, N. F., July 31, 1876.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sin: When the Republican party put before the country Mr. Hayes as its candidate there was satisfaction at once felt by all Independent voters through-

THE DEMOCRATIC CRY OF REPORM.

to the Editor of The Tribune. Sin: The Democrats keep ringing the cry of Reform in the people's cars from morning this night. Their platform, too, bristles with it. It seems to be tout upon this issue they expect to win in the coming fight, if they win as all. Now, it is true that reform is needed, and sadly needed too, in many branches of the Government, but is not this cry as hollow as an empty vesself to we not want ome further carnest, some more satisfactory, token of sincerily than the mere word of that party, who, during the very last years they were in power, pillered elough from the United States Government to carry on the rebellion for five years I it is the same purty, and people with the same spirit, who want the power now that during those years were attempting the subversion of the Government. Can there be any sincerily in their ery, "Reform t"

Flemington, N. J., July 29, 1876. apon this issue they expect to win in the coming fight,

REFORM AT ST. LOUIS AND CINCINNATI.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sin: In April last the respective parties were teld by Liberals and Independents that they would require of them reform Presidential candidates. The Cincinnati Convention cast aside Bristow, the only Republican identified with reform, commended the Administralican identified with reform, commended the Administration of President Grant, and through a combination of
the Mortons, the Camerons, the Contilings, the Chandlers,
and United States officials, nominated "the Great
Unknown." The St. Louis Convention nominated one
whose reform record is world-wide, and in this respect
conformed to the demand of Independents. Although
willing to concede to other members of the Reform
League the right that I claim for myself, yet to be consistent to the purposes of our organization, I must say
my duty appears plain to support Mr. Tilden.

Warren, Fenn., July 22, 1876.

John Sill.

COURAGE OF SOUTHERN REPUBLICANS.

To the Editor of The Tribune. SIR: We have firm and strong men leading

the Republican party here, but they cannot perform im possibilities. Our party is composed of men generally who lost their all during the war. Consequently our means are limited, and we cannot at all times secure the means are immed, and we cannot at an index secure accomparation of the colored vote. The outlook at present is favorable, and we expect to make a firm stand. There are just as bitter feelings of malice and batted burning in the Southern bosom as in the dark days of the war, and every bemocratic gain adds fresh fuel to the flame. In the face of all this how can true men North vote against the best interests of thousands who immigrated South since the war?

Pikeville, Ienn., July 27, 1876.

HAYES MUST ATTACK GRANTISM. To the Editor of The Tribune.

SIR: Mr. Hayes places himself before the people as a reformer. The leeches who characterize the present Republican mal-administration are yet endeav-oring to suck the last drop of our poor triuned blood. oring to suck the last drop of our poor trianed blood. Vice and corruption infest Washington and spread their evil influence throughout the entire country. These facts gauted, how can Mr. Hayes "as a reformer" refuse to condemn and repudiate Grantism 1 if Mr. Hayes is for reform, let him boidiy cry down all that Grant has done in the last eight years. If he has not that courage, then he is unwortay of holding the candidacy as a reformer.

\*\*New-York\*\*, Aug. 1, 1876.\*\*

\*\*AMERICUS.\*\*

HAYES AND TILDEN.

To the Edstor of The Tribune. Sin: You admit Tilden is a good man.

not Hayes backed up by the worst Administration that ever existed since the formation of this Government, and who doubts, if elected, his administration will be a continuation of Grantism (CONSERVATIVE. continuation of Grantism Otisrule, July 29, 1876.

NO PROOF OF CHANGE IN ITS VALUE WHERE PY. CLUSIVELY USED-PURCHASING POWER OF GOLD ADVANCED - PAYMENT OF BONDHOLDERS IN

SILVER EQUITABLE.

To the Editor of The Tribune. SIR: Opponents of the double standard have not been able to meet the argument, suggested in these

etters already, that it is lawful to pay silver for all debts

contracted prior to 1873. But they enter the plea of

equity, and rest it upon two assertions, viz., that silver has greatly declined in value, and that it would decline still more if used by this country as a legal tender. The first assertion is suproved, and the second is absurd. It is not shown that the purchasing power of allver has declined. In any country where it has not been by gov-ernmental interference wholly or partially demonstized t will buy nearly as much of the products of human labor generally as it would buy four years ago. By business men whose dealings femiliarize them with the range of prices in silver-using countries, the truth of this statement will be acknowledged; and in testimony before Mr. Goschen's Committee, Mr. Bagehot, a gentleman recognized as of the highest authority in financial questions, stated that if there should be any appreciable rise of prices in such countries—as for example in India—the

mist says:

It is plain that no such additional silver as would be required by very greatly raised prices over the large area of the East supwhers exists. General prices here have not risen in any such ratio as 20 per cont; what has alone so varied is the relation of silver to gold in the London market, and in the markets guided by it.

result would be to stimulate production of commodities,

and thus to speedily counteract that change. In com

meuting upon Mr. Goschen's report, The London Econo-

silver is used as the sole measure of values and medium of exchange by more than 500,000,000 people. They have in circulation in those vast areas of the East \$2,100,000,000 in silver, and an advance of 20 per cent in prices would require an additional supply of \$420,000,000, beside the \$50,000,000 annually required to supply the waste and loss of the world's stock. apply can be obtained. Prices of commodities in the Eastern countries therefore cannot thus advance, and by prices there the commerce of the whole civilized world is argely governed. What, then, must happen if the relation of silver to gold changes! Not rise of prices in silver-using countries, since that is impossible, but fall of prices in gold-using countries. The purchasing power of prices in gold-using countries. The purchasing power of silver cannot fall without a total change in those vast regions where change is most slow and difficult. There-fore, if the relation of the metals changes, the result must be seen in an advance of the purchasing power of rold. Whether this position be disputed or not, it is not shown that there has been any decrease in the purchasing power of silver in India and China, and it is indisputable that there has been no such decrease as to cause a con

siderable rise of prices there.

But it is true that the price of gold has risen, and that remarkably. Prices in all countries where gold is the me sure of values have fallen very materially within the past four years. The demonstration would be easy if the necessary array of figures could be given within the limits of a newspaper letter, but to intelligent men who know the course of trade and prices it is superfluous. In this country, since 1873, gold has been practically the only measure of values, and we know what has occurred here. In England the fail of prices has been such as to bring disaster to every important industry. In Germany, though the task of demonstring sliver is incomplete, the fail of prices has caused commercial and industrial disaster scarcely less than has been seen in Great

Evidently, then, the change within the post four year has been a great advance in the purchasing power of gold, because prices in countries where gold is the measare have fallen. But there has been no corresponding decline in the purchasing price of silver, first, because prices in silver-using countries have not advanced, and econd, because the builton price of silver in gold has not declined as much as the average prices of commodities generally in gold-using countries. The average price of silver, for many years prior to 1872, was from 59 to 61 pence per ounce; it is now a little less than 51 pence, with an upward tendency. The decline has been less than 20 per cent in the gold price of silver. But the average decline in the gold price of other commodities within four years has been greater than 20 per cent.

We are told that it is not equity to pay debts in silver, because its gold price has fallen. But equity requires that we should pay the same value, in purchasing power as to commodities generally, that we borrowed. It not equitable, on the contrary it is the very reverse of equitable, to demand that we, having promised to pay gold or silver, should pay gold because its purchasing power has greatly advanced.

But we are told that if we resume the use of silver its price will fall still more. If by this it is meant that the difference between gold and silver in general purchasing power will increase, so much the more unjust is it to demand payment of a greater purchasing power than we berrowed and promised to pay. But the statement is palpably absurd. Increased use of silver to the extent of one or two hundred millions cannot leaven, but will sarely increase, its purchasing power. There is no reason to expect a greater decline in the gold price of silver, unless by governmental act it is driven from its chief use in other countries. Have we any right to do that thing m order to earlich still further these who held obligations

originally established. If it is unconstitutional to impair the obligation of contracts, it is clearly unconstitutional to require that a debior shall pay a higher purchasing power than he borrowed and contracted to pay. But Mr. Websier seems to go yet further. He seems to declare that it would be unconstitutional to change the standard even with respect to future contracts. Why! Because the easet would be to after by legislation the value of all fixed investments of property. On that point possibly a word or two at another time. New-York, July 27, 1876.

THE LETTER OF THE BOND.

To the Editor of the Tribune. Siz: Mr. Thurlow Weed never takes up his pen except to write something sensible and practical Although a hard-money man myself, his recent common nieztion has made me a convert to the "Silver bill." if gold and silver were both legal tenders when this Gov erminent was creating these leass—and the word "gold" does not appear either in the original law or the bond will some one please tell me why the Government should not redeem either in gold or sliver, or in both f If some one answers, "Gur Government has reduced the stanone answers, "Our Government has reduced the standard or intrinsic value of silver," then I say let the Government restore it to just what it was, and be honest in the matter. If you enswer, "The standard of silver has desreciated in the markets of the world," I say this is the bundholders' mistortune. The people in Europe took all our bonds with their eyes open. If the bond says rold, pay it in gold; if not, gold or silver. It is full time that a word should be said in favor of the poor debtor class, and if the passage of the Silver bill is inflation, let it be inflation. If it depreciates the market value of Government bonds, it will arrest the depactation of other property, or rather tend to appreciate it.

\*\*New-York\*\*, Aug. 1, 1876.\*

\*\*JUMARO.\*\*

PAY THE BONDS WITH COPPER COINS. To the Editor of The Tribune. Sin: Most of your correspondents argue that

our Government will fully redeem its pledge to pay its obligations in coin by giving its creditors silver coin. would like to ask whether they would give the trade dotlar of 420 grains, or the lighter coinage (4121/2 grains to the dollar), and would further suggest to these gentlethe dollar), and would further suggest to these geathernen that they seem to have lost sight of the copper cois. The old units believe copper cent would be just the thing to pay the bondholders with. It was "coin" of standard fineness when these obligations were incurred. By all means, then, let Six lock have his pound of fiesh in old-fashioned copper pointies.

New York, July 31, 1876.

THE LAW OF 1853. To the Editor of the Tribune

Sin: Your correspondents repeat again and again that silver ceased to be a legal tender by the act of Congress in 1873. But I remember very distinctly that the bill of 1853, which reduced the silver half dollar from 206 4 grains to 194, deprived silver of its character as money except for sums under \$5. As all our Government bonds have been issued since that date, they are payable in sold cein only, and any attempt to pay them in silver wind on a breach of fatth.

Oukland, Md., July 28, 1876.

THE COAL COMBINATION.

To the Editor of The Trioune. Sin: Little sympathy is felt for the "Bourben directors" in the coal-carrying roads at the decise in their favorite securities. The remarkable decise should have satisfied these gentlemen by this time that they cannot force spon a community even so indispensable an article as coal at prices raing previous to the panic. This is true also concerning the manufacturing interest of New-England, together with the iron interest interest of New-England, together with the iron interest of Pennsylvania. Combinations have been tried over and over again. Lumber, petroleam, wheat, four, pet, iron, guita pereba, and "what not "have been tried, and all combinations have come to grief. This country is a fittle too large for "combinations" to flourish, and if the community will "hold of "a little longer, they will see out sided to the list.

New-York, July 31, 1876.